

## The Evening World.

ESTABLISHED BY JOSEPH PULITZER.  
Published Daily Except Sunday by The Evening World Publishing Company, No. 53 to 63 Park Row, New York.  
R. ALPHEUS PULITZER, President, 63 Park Row.  
J. ANTHONY SIKAW, Treasurer, 63 Park Row.  
JOSEPH PULITZER, Jr., Secretary, 63 Park Row.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS.  
The Associated Press is a regularly chartered corporation for the publication of all news, dispatches, and other information, and is not a newspaper. It is not a newspaper and does not have the local news published herein.

### THE RIGHT MAN TO TACKLE IT.

IF EXPERIENCE is any guide, the betting fraternity would be justified in laying long odds against a successful solution of the Irish problem.

Time and again Irish affairs have shown promise, only to go from bad to worse as statesmen and politicians disagreed on terms.

But whatever the odds may have been a week ago, they have been reduced. The change for the better comes from the part which Jan Smuts is playing.

In Africa, in the war, at the Peace Conference and in Africa again, Jan Smuts has shown himself a man of liberal views and of marked persuasive ability, a statesman of the first rank. Without any fuss and feathers the South African Premier has set about doing what he can to bring about a settlement and peace in Ireland. His entry into the muddle may not bring the desired results, but it makes peace more probable.

He is one figure of stout integrity and moral conviction. He is one man in the British Empire deserving of the confidence of both the Irish and the English. The whole world will wish him well in his venture.

"You can't have ideals on an empty stomach," Ambassador Herrick said last evening.

This helps to explain the G. O. P. campaign of 1920. The party managers were hungry—for patronage and perquisites.

### MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT PROVIDES JOBS FOR UNEMPLOYED.

NEW BRITAIN, Conn., is making an experiment in tax collection and unemployment relief. The city provides work for unemployed property owners. Wages are applied to tax bills.

It is further proposed to provide work for unemployed rentpayers, the city to turn over the wages to the creditor landlords.

This New Britain experiment is a step in advance. It entails a conscious effort by the municipality to provide work on public improvements in times of industrial depression. This is a practice which social economists have recommended, but with only meagre success.

The wisdom of making public improvements in times of industrial depression is obvious. But such a policy involves planning and preparation not often present in municipal administrations.

New York has recently had a lesson in the way in which municipal improvements ought not to be made. A year ago, when building costs were at the peak and workers were busy, the Hylan Administration was determined to rush construction of a new Court House which wasn't particularly necessary at the moment.

To-day when building costs have declined and many are out of work the same Administration is not building schools, which are imperatively needed.

If Hylan had planned some schools last year and more schools whenever employment conditions warranted, and even a Court House when unemployment became acute, it would have been evidence of competence and foresight. Instead we have had a programme of muddle and muddle, a perfect example of how municipal improvement ought not to proceed.

The result is that to-day New York has not enough schoolhouses and many of the structures used for schools are unsafe and unsanitary.

In the continued clash between Senate and House over the final shape of the Naval Appropriation Bill, the Borah disarmament amendment remains safe and sure. There are still some popular demands that Congress hear straight.

### AN OILY MUDDLE.

DESPATCH of two war vessels to Tampico lends pertinence to the consideration of oil taxes and tariffs.

War vessels are needed in Tampico, it is said, because of threatening labor troubles which may affect American interests. The labor troubles in turn are caused by a shutdown of American oil shipments. The American producers claim they cannot afford to ship oil because of the export tax Mexico levies. They claim this action is not a boycott.

The tax, according to figures given by the Times yesterday, amounts to 43½ cents a barrel on crude oil. Either this is prohibitive or else the producers in the Tampico field are engaged in economic conspiracy against Mexico.

At the same time the Tariff Bill now before Congress would levy a tariff of 35 cents a barrel on imports of crude oil. If 43½ cents is prohibitive, certainly a combined tax of 43½ plus 35 cents, or 78½ cents, would be prohibitive. The American market would be completely "protected" and the American oil supply would be exhausted as rapidly as possible.

American companies not interested in Mexican

oil fields want a tariff of \$1 a barrel. They have no objection to the Mexican tax which hinders competitive importations. But the big international companies do not want either an export tax or an import tax, because these would boost prices until the demand would decrease and profits would decline.

Here we have the makings of a pretty contest in Congress. It will bear watching. But how in the sacred name of "protection" can a Republican Administration object to a Mexican export tax which will keep oil out of this country and out of competition with home production? That is precisely the result which Mr. Fordney hopes to attain with his tariff bill.

### WHOSE ADMINISTRATION?

IRRECONCILABLES or no irreconcilables who should President Harding have to have anybody make up his mind for him about resubmitting the Versailles Treaty to the United States Senate?

In his first message to Congress the President declared, as plainly as words could put it, his conviction that the wiser course would seem to be to engage, with reservations, "under the existing treaty."

Secretary Hughes may, as David Lawrence believes, be urging the President that, since the peace resolution claims rights for the United States under the armistice and the Treaty of Versailles, it would be worse than inconsistent for the United States to refuse to become in any degree a party to that treaty.

But why should the President need such urging? He has himself been more explicit than Mr. Hughes in declaring the peace resolution insufficient and frankly adding that "it would be idle to declare for separate treaties of peace with the Central Powers on the assumption that these alone would be adequate."

The President cannot refuse to resubmit the existing treaty without reversing himself.

Moreover, the reasons for being all things to all factions are not as strong now as they were when the paramount Republican purpose was to hold those factions together long enough to win the election.

If President Harding meant what he said in his message about engaging under the existing treaty, now is the time to prove it and at the same time demonstrate whether this is his Administration or the Administration of a handful of rancorous Senators who would belittle their country for all time rather than seem to approve anything in which Woodrow Wilson ever had so much as a finger.

Nobody expects the Senate as now constituted to ratify the Versailles Treaty without reservations.

But if President Harding fails to stand by the major part of the "existing treaty" and does not submit it to the Senate, he will put himself on record as the weakest, most variable and vacillating Chief Executive that ever sacrificed national consistency and honor through fear of a few noisy, narrow-minded obstructionists in his party.

Whose Administration is it?

### SAYS THE DAIRYMAN:

"ALL the milk that is drunk in New York City comes from cows."

Here is a thought-provoker. Did you know it? The statement is from an advertisement of the Dairyman's League Co-operative Association, Inc.

It may seem that the dairymen have been taking the comic sheets too seriously. Most city dwellers know that the story of the little boy who preferred his milk from a bottle and not from a cow is an exaggeration.

But this advertisement is something more than a statement of elementary platitudes. It is evidence of the co-operative effort of the milk producers. It ought to stimulate something of the sort in the thoughts of the consumers. It is a clear-cut effort to go over the heads of the middlemen and their toll-taking methods.

This is the note which closes the advertisement: "When the milk farmer and the milk drinker know each other a little better, there will be less misunderstanding about this very necessary and valuable food."

That is another statement even more provocative of thought than the first.

### A WINNER.

It is idle for anybody to gainsay, and it would not be wisdom for Secretary Hughes to ignore, that the very name of the Versailles Treaty, part and parcel as it is of the League of Nations, now utterly discredited everywhere on the face of the earth, is not and for many years cannot be looked upon with anything but abhorrence by the great mass of the people of the United States—New York Herald.

For unmitigated, unrelieved animosity the above deserves a prize.

To pick an awarding committee we need look no further than some of the most eminent leaders of the Republican Party itself.

## The Guardian Angel!

Copyright, 1921, by The Evening World Publishing Co. (The New York Evening World).

By John Cassel



### From Evening World Readers

What kind of a letter do you find most readable? Isn't it the one that gives you the worth of a thousand words in a couple of hundred? There is fine mental exercise and a lot of satisfaction in trying to say much in a few words. Take time to be brief.

#### A Conundrum.

To the Editor of the Evening World:

One of the services of only one audit company engaged by the Anti-Saloon League to count the marchers in the Anti-Prohibition parade and the number of bottles that company was 14,022, how many audit companies would it take to count the remainder of Anti-Prohibitionists who they allowed to vote on that issue next election? I was not in that parade and neither were several others. J. C. B. Brooklyn, July 5, 1921.

#### Who Are the "Good Sports"?

To the Editor of the Evening World:

One Congressman stated that one of his fellow members who voted for Prohibition could drink more in one day than he would drink in a year, and he voted against it. Also, it is said that a Senator stocked his cellar with \$20,000 worth of "booze" before voting for Prohibition. Now along comes Mr. Anderson appealing to the people to be "good sports" and accept this law. It is no wonder that Prohibition is a joke. How much money was handed over for the passage of this fool law? And who paid it? An investigation ought to disclose some very interesting news. New York, June 30, 1921.

#### A Moral Victory.

To the Editor of the Evening World:

A boxing bout for world championship has been held at Jersey City, attended by representative American and European citizens. The morals of the world are none the worse for it. It is true that among the ninety thousand people present were Governors, Mayors, noblemen, women of distinction, legal lights—and who not?—who coupled the admission fee with desire. They were a wonderfully orderly lot. They were representative people of many countries. The "I-am-better-than-thou" say they were "lawbreakers."

While the bout between Dempsey and Carpenter went on, a victory for the world's great majority was retained. The historic world heavyweight championship, there was at that bout an even greater victory scored. It is conservative to state that 85 per cent of the people of the world are either favorable to or indifferent concerning prize fighting for championships; that has not per cent, directly oppose it. In other words, a great majority are decidedly interested in deliberate discussions between two men who elect to knock out or be knocked out, and to abide by the result, for a prize.

The chief victory of the Dempsey-Carpenter bout was that of the world's great majority who retain a great deal of the attitude of the "reformers." The attitude of the Governor of New Jersey, the Mayor of Jersey City and a Grand Jury greatly aided in the victory and was an attitude that the world majority appreciate. In contrast, the sneaking attitude of the "reformers" of the world is a disgrace. It is a disgrace that in full accord with their small minds. It was quite as characteristic as that assumed by the same lot when

they took advantage of a lacking organized opposition to the amendment of the Eighteenth Amendment, put over when thousands of our representative citizens were fighting in France for world and American freedom.

It would seem that the time has arrived when organized opposition against organized "reformers" should be effected. Gov. Edwards and Mayor Hague have rung "time." Why not knock out the "reformers" and why not begin now? Thus only can we defend true American rights. American freedom, like the American flag, is too precious to be trodden on by a few meddlers who are eager for newspaper notoriety and cheap election prominence. Voters need thinking, tenements need attention, public comfort stations need re-establishing (wiped out by the will of the majority), and much else needs attention. I commend the meddlers to these activities, if indeed they must work off their pent-up enthusiasm. I am neither a drinking man nor a sports fan, but I have grown to detest this bunch of buttinskies and am eager to line up against the lot who are daily seeking to de-Americanize America. Organization alone will combat them. E. M. R. New York, July 4, 1921.

#### An Interpretation.

To the Editor of the Evening World:

What happened to the 200,000 people who were to have marched in the Anti-Prohibition Parade on July 4? I suppose the Anti-Prohibitionists will explain that there are many more thousands of people who oppose Prohibition but did not march. Why didn't they? It is either because they did not have the strength of their convictions or because they were afraid that they might be recognized in the line and pointed out as drinkers.

Not only did New York make a bad showing, but Jersey City, with a population of 294,000, only turned out 4,000 marchers. Close behind Jersey City came Baltimore with 375 marchers, of whom we are told two-thirds were foreigners.

What conclusion is drawn from this demonstration? Why, only one. The majority of the people are satisfied with prohibition.

JAMES V. EVERARD.

New York, July 5, 1921.

#### Irish in the Revolution.

To the Editor of the Evening World:

A great deal has recently appeared in the press concerning the signers of the Declaration of Independence who were Irishmen. Among them were Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who was of Irish descent, his grandfather was born in Ireland; Matthew B. Smith of New Hampshire, was born in Ireland; George Taylor of Pennsylvania, was born in Ireland; George Read was born in Dublin, Ireland; Edward Rutledge of South Carolina, was born in Connaught, Ireland.

Lecky, an English historian, in his book of the American Revolution (Vol. II, p. 180), "Ireland was committed to the American cause on Jan. 25, 1773. Lord George Walpole wrote that 'all

### UNCOMMON SENSE

By John Blake

(Copyright, 1921, by John Blake.)

BE INTERESTED OR YOU'LL NEVER BE INTERESTING.

Uninteresting people are always uninterested people. If you cannot interest yourself you cannot interest others. And your chances of getting along in this world depend pretty largely in your ability to interest others.

The most interesting people in the world are those who are successfully doing important things. No man can successfully do an important thing unless he is enthusiastically interested in it. He can, if he has such an interest, communicate at least a part of it to others. In that way he can attract their attention and usually excite their admiration and trust.

Christopher Columbus would never have discovered America had he not become tremendously interested in the belief that the world was round and that it would be possible, by circumnavigating it, to find the rich Indies that lay on the other side.

He succeeded in infecting rich people and finally the Queen of Spain with this interest. She supplied him with the funds to make his first voyage.

But his job was not done with this. He had constantly to keep his crew interested in his plans during many long weeks of sailing over uncharted seas. He had even to make their interest triumph over their fears, and a man has to be interested indeed when he can accomplish such a miracle as that.

If you are tremendously interested in what you are doing you can invariably arouse the interest of others in it. When you have done that you have won them, as every salesman will tell you.

What we call personality is the quality of arousing interest in others. The dull, apathetic, listless chap, who pays no attention to his surroundings and has no thought but getting through his day's work in the easiest possible fashion never impresses his fellows.

At work or at play he is just an average man, neither to be cultivated nor avoided—a man without personality and without interest.

The job hunter who for an instant's time can persuade a prospective employer that he is interested in what he wants to do will get the job if it is there. The man who wants it merely because it will keep him out of the poorhouse will never get it unless there is a heavy shortage of men.

It ought to be easy to become interested in this world, for it is filled with tremendously interesting things. Pick out one of them, or a dozen, and study them. The study will develop your interest and your efforts will, if they are sincere enough, interest you. Then you can interest others—perhaps millions of others—and in that event you will have no further need of lying awake nights to wonder what is to become of you.

was America mad."

In a speech in Parliament in 1775 Lord Chatham said, "Ireland is with America to a man," and in 1776 he said, "The whole Irish nation favors the Americans." And Lord Mountbatten in Parliament said "You lost America by Ireland."

In 1778 Ambrose Serle, confidential agent of the British Cabinet in this country, wrote "Great numbers of Irish emigrants, particularly Irish, are in the rebel army."

In March, 1778, Sir Henry Clinton, Commander-in-Chief of the British Army in America, wrote to Lord Howe in London: "The emi-

grants from Ireland are in general our most dangerous opponents."

Before an English Parliamentary inquiry in 1779, Joseph Galloway, a renegade American, stated that the American Revolutionary Army was one-half Irish, and before the same commission General Robertson, an English officer, testified, "I remember Gen. Charles Lee telling me he had saved one-half the rebel army were from Ireland."

There were 1,500 commissioned officers of Irish birth in the Revolutionary Army and the navy. P. L. PHILLIPS.

Brooklyn, July 5, 1921.

## The Pioneers of Progress

By Svetozar Torjoroff

Copyright, 1921, by The Evening World Publishing Co. (The New York Evening World).

### XXIV.—THE MAN WHO MADE THE ENGLISH A NATION.

To Duke William the Norman history must accord the credit for that great achievement, the welding of the warring peoples of Britain into a nation.

For centuries before the "Conqueror's" fleet cast anchor off Pavensey, off the south coast of England, in 1066, Britain had been a seething cauldron of racial rivalries and racial combinations.

Anglo (or Englishmen) had succeeded Roman as the power of the empire waned under Germanic assaults. In his turn Anglo, or Saxon, had quailed before the fierce onslaughts of the Dane.

Amid the confusion and the bloodshed a great factor in civilization—the greatest colonizing and pioneering power in history—was slowly emerging out of the smoke and welter. What was needed was a strong hand that could build enduring institutions to give character, permanence and unity to the effervescent mass.

Duke William had the strong hand. He had inherited it from a long series of fighting and administering ancestors whose original stock came from the forests and the fjords of the North.

In the passage of generations this virile stock had become partly French. It had mingled in the contest between the peoples on either side of the English Channel. It had acquired something of the strength of Celtic, Roman-French, institution. It had become a factor in the rising civilization of the period.

Like most conquerors, William based his claim to a throne that did not belong to him on a fact that has the semblance of legality. He maintained that the throne had been promised him by Edward the Confessor.

When the throne, upon the death of Edward, went to Harold, Duke William appeared off Pavensey. "Surrender the throne or fight for it," was the gist of his remark to Harold. Picking his own battleground, near Hastings, Harold elected to fight.

After a battle worthy of the middle of both continents, Norman chivalry, aided by the hand of chance that drove a Norman arrow into Harold's right eye, one of the gravest decisions of history went to Duke William.

On the evening after the battle he camped on the spot where Harold had made his last stand with his huscarls. It is quaintly related by a chronicler that the Conqueror "sate down to eat and drink among the dead."

With the Battle of Hastings William started the processes that eventually formed the language now spoken by the greatest number of people over the largest extent of territory in history.

He gave peace and the strength of steel to a race that had been dominated an empire on which the sun never sets.

He gave laws, customs and traditions that form the warp of our own institutions.

The final and conclusive test of William's theory that he was badly needed across the Channel is to be found in the fact that a few months after the Battle of Hastings, he was the recognized King of England. His throne was so secure that he left London for a visit to Normandy.

And since his death, the English iron which he gave it has endured much as he fashioned it.

### WHERE DID YOU GET THAT WORD?

47—MEANDER.

The word "meander" carries a story of olden times. It is derived straight line from the classic writings, the works of Virgil and of the Greek poets, including Homer. There was, and still is, for that matter, a river in Phrygia called in ancient times the Meandros (Latin Meandrus).

It is said to be "meandered" on a course that its name came to be applied to a similar circuitous path followed by a human being. Hence, the country boy who is strolling aimlessly with many turnings and twistings through a leafy lane is said to be doing what the river Meandrus has been doing for these many centuries.

This quaint word is another illustration of the brotherhood of men and the continuity of the current of time as it flows down—or upwards—through the ages.

### "That's a Fact"

By Albert P. Southwick

Copyright, 1921, by The Evening World Publishing Co. (The New York Evening World).

Cornelis Melyn, a Dutch merchant, made the third attempt to found a settlement on Staten Island. He came from Antwerp and his first visit here was made in 1639, obtaining an order from the directors on July 3, 1640, authorizing him to take possession of Staten Island and "convert it into a colony." On his second visit in February, 1641, the vessel in which he sailed was captured by the "Dunkirkers," losing all he had on board and, after "bad" experience, reached his native shores in safety.

Cornelis Melyn made a second attempt and embarked with his family and some goods for trade with the Indians, to the value of about 1,000 guilders, on the Eckenboom (meaning "hook tree"), reaching New Amsterdam on Aug. 29, 1641. The directors gave him letters patent, dated June 19, 1642, for entire Staten Island, excepting the bouwerie of Capt. de Vrie.

Staten Island was again purchased from the Indians on April 12, 1670, and it is noted in history as "one of the most prominent acts in the Administration of Governor Lovelace, because it was the final extinction of the Indian claim to the island." The original deed is preserved in the State Library at Albany, N. Y.

The Indians were always ready to sell Staten Island. In 1646 they sold it to Michael Pauw; shortly after he sold a part to David Pieterse Vries; in 1641 to Cornelis Melyn; in 1637 to Baron Van Capellen; lastly, in 1670, to Gov. Lovelace.